[redacted]

U.B.C. Planning Papers

School of Community and Regional Planning

University of British Columbia
Vancouver, British Columbia

91-04788/

ISSN: 0828-2390412

Looking Up at the Region:
Regional Issues from a Community Development Perspective

Peter Boothroyd

CPI #29
February 1991

UBC PLANNING PAPERS
Canadian Planning Issues #29

School of Community and Regional Planning
University of British Columbia
6333 Memorial Road
Vancouver, B.C. V6T 1W5
Canada

Looking up at the Region:
Regional Issues from a Community Development Perspective

by
Peter Boothroyd, Associate Professor
School of Community and Regional Planning
University of British Columbia

Abstract

Regional planning theory began as criticism of urbanization forms in market-dominated industrializing society. With the evolution of the welfare state, regional theory became technocratic support for the top-down development of regions and for the structuring of inter-governmental relations at senior and local levels. With the welfare state's growing inability to manage the macro-economy, ensure welfare, and solve problems of "underdevelopment", many regional theorists have returned to criticism. The criticism now is not just of the naked market but also of the bureaucratic state.

Though the objects of criticism have been clearly identified, the solutions under the general heading of "bottom-up" development theory have been obscure. In particular, the source of bottom-up planning has not been well defined. Should it be the smallest community, the district, the sub-national region, non-government movements, enlightened experts, or a state more sensitive to local needs?

With the renewal, in the 1980s, of communities as proactive developers of their own economies and social organization, the answer about the bottom is coming clear: in true bottom up-planning, it is the community which should control the process and define its own goals, issues, and strategies.

Local communities are, in fact, doing more of their own planning. But in so doing they also increasingly realize they cannot go it alone. They see the need for inter-community co-operation, particularly through the bottom-up creation of their own regional institutions to manage resources, deliver programs, lobby the welfare state, and deal in the market. A new task for regional theorists, then, is to help discover the principles by which communities can successfully structure and manage their inter-relationships.

Assuming continuing decline of the welfare state and the renewal of community, regional theory will have to change its critical stance into one of planning support, just as it so changed in the 1930s. Only now, the support will be for community leaders rather than welfare state technocrats.

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. CRITICAL REGIONAL THEORY IN MARKET-DOMINATED INDUSTRIALIZING SOCIETY 1

3. TECHNOCRATIC REGIONAL THEORY IN AN EXPANDING WELFARE STATE 2
   - 3.1 Regional Disparity 3
   - 3.2 Central vs. Regional Governments 4
   - 3.3 Regional Coordination of Local Governments and Services 6
   - 3.4 International Responsibilities of the Welfare State 10
   - 3.5 Overview of Regional Theory in the Welfare State 11

4. CRITICAL BOTTOM-UP REGIONAL THEORY IN A DECLINING WELFARE STATE 11

5. EMERGING COMMUNITY-CENTRED REGIONAL THEORY IN A TIME OF COMMUNITY RENEWAL 15
   - 5.1 Renewal of Community 15
   - 5.2 Regional Associations of Communities 17

6. CONCLUSION 21

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper argues that with the decline of the welfare state and the revival of community as a social force, regional planning theorists will have to turn their attention to a new set of social issues.[1] Without neglecting their responsibility to inform state policy on regions, their new supplemental mission will be to provide theoretical support for community planners creating regional processes and institutions from the bottom up.

In order to make its argument that regional theory is at an important turning point, the paper traces the evolution of regional theory through four historical periods: market- dominated industrializing society before the welfare state, rise of the welfare state (1930's to 1970's), decline of the welfare state (1970's and 1980's), and renewal of community (1980's). For each period, the characteristic societal evolution and implications for regional theory are described.

The paper is written from a Canadian perspective. This means that even though the paper traces an evolution of theory which the paper assumes to be international, most of the examples and references given are Canadian.

2. CRITICAL REGIONAL THEORY IN MARKET-DOMINATED INDUSTRIALIZING SOCIETY

The period when the market dominated industrializing societies lasted into the 1930s. Regional theory is often considered to have begun toward the end of this period with Ebenezer Howard's vision of the garden city (1902) and/or Patrick Geddes' critique of industrial conurbations (1915.) The roots of American regional theory are usually traced back to the formation of the Regional Planning Association of America in 1923. The prodigious Lewis Mumford, who carried on Howard's and Geddes' call for balance between town and country in the design of industrial regions (1938) is perhaps the best known RPAA member.

---

[1] This paper was presented in a longer version to the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Canadian Regional Science Association held at Laval University, Quebec City, June 1-2, 1989.

In Canada, Thomas Adams provided, between his British and American careers, theoretical credence (1917) and pragmatic leadership to voices decrying the complementary trends of urban crowding and rural decline.

The ideological agenda of the early regional theorists was to have public planning in some measure gain control over market forces shaping urban and regional development. Because capitalism was only beginning to be tempered by welfare concepts, regional theory was only a little concerned with institutional issues of centralization, structure, and decision-making, and hardly at all with planning process issues of participation, proactivity, comprehensiveness, incrementalism, etc. Regional theory was what today's social theorists would call "critical", i.e., critical of the dominant market-oriented urbanizing processes and their impacts on urban and rural life.

3. TECHNOCRATIC REGIONAL THEORY IN AN EXPANDING WELFARE STATE

The welfare state arose in the 1930's to smooth out business cycles and mitigate social distress caused by the market. After World War II, until the mid 1970's, the power, scope and confidence of the welfare state expanded in concert with a steadily growing economy.

The welfare state continued to rely on private enterprise and the market for most production and distribution, but used Keynesian economic principles to control the speed of the economy so as to maintain employment levels without much price inflation. It also instituted various welfare programs and regulations to provide a minimum standard of living for all individuals and some degree of equality across regions. Welfare program growth was supportable in the steadily growing managed economy. Conversely, welfare programs were useful for stimulating the economy in slow times (e.g., post-war housing programs), though difficult to cut back in boom times.

As the shape of the Keynesian welfare state began to be mapped out through the American New Deal in the 1930's, Canada's Rowell-Sirois Commission at the turn of the decade and Marsh report in 1943, and Britain's Beveridge report in 1942, the fundamental and unending issue of public planning vs. market began to be refined into how the state could achieve social goals by influencing, but not harming, the market. Complex intra-state issues, then inter-state issues, also began to attract regionalists' attention.

Four theoretical regional questions faced the welfare state with its contradictory beliefs in equal opportunity and the market: how should a welfare state deal with internal regional disparity? what should be the powers and responsibilities of central and regional governments respectively? how should the central or regional welfare state provide for the micro-regional coordination of local governments and local welfare services? what is the responsibility of welfare states for poorer regions outside their boundaries?

3.1 Regional Disparity

At a general level, the answer to the internal regional disparity question was straightforward, once one accepted the welfare state premise that it should promote equality by influencing the market: the state should somehow stimulate market-oriented production in "depressed" regions to help them catch up. From the beginnings of each welfare state, political opinion has steadfastly supported this proposition.

In Canada, for example, the Rowell Sirois Report (Canada 1940) promoted the principle of regional equality and the need for a fiscally and constitutionally strong central government to enforce it. The 1982 Constitution Act enshrined the principle with more force than was afforded protection of individuals' rights. Whereas individuals' fundamental freedoms, legal rights and equality rights can be set aside under the "notwithstanding" clause of the Constitution, there is no such equivocation where the Act commits the federal and provincial governments to reduce regional disparity .

Exactly how the welfare state should stimulate economies in depressed regions has not been as easy a question to answer as whether the state should intervene at all. This question has been the subject of debate among politicians, businessmen, technocrats, and academics, and occasionally "ordinary citizens' of the depressed regions.

The possibilities for state stimulation of regions are numerous. In the United States, for example, the forms have been as varied as setting up the Tennessee Valley Administration in 1933 to ongoing defence contract pork-barrelling.

In Canada, from the 1950's into the 1970's, the federal government fought regional disparity by experimenting with various forms of rural development programs, location incentives for manufacturers, infrastructure assistance to urban growth centres, relocation of government offices, inter-provincial equalization payments, regionally differentiated federal assistance to

individuals, stimulation of megaprojects, and regional economic development agreements and funds. (See Weaver and Gunton, 1982; Savoie, 1986a and 1986b; Coffey and Polese, 1987; Bradfield, 1988). The provinces have experimented with their own internal regional development strategies.

Academic support for state experimentation in stimulating regional market economies began with the work of such regional theorists as Perroux (1950) and Isard (1956). "Regional science" associations (beginning 1954) and journals, emerged from the academies to guide technocrats in program design. Techniques for analyzing regional economies and theories of regional development processes were invented, debated, refined and applied. "Input-output", "economic base", and "growth poles" became household words for development planners and bureaucrats everywhere. Canadian theorists such as Watkins (1963) made their own unique contribution with the elaboration of staple theory. Regional theory had found an appealing and rewarding role in guiding welfare state technocrats in their top-down regional development planning.

The influence of regional science on government practice peaked with the welfare state itself at the turn of the decade into the 1970s.[2] In the urban planning field, scientism and technocracy was being discredited because of arrogant and insensitive approaches to public housing, urban renewal, urban transportation, and new towns, at the same time as the welfare state was running out of resources for massive physical re-development. In regional development planning, technocratic arrogance and insensitivity showed up in such areas as village consolidation among Newfoundland outports and remote Indian bands. But the major flaw perceived in technocratic regional planning was that it could not deliver the goods: regional disparity was not being reduced (Coffey and Polese, 1987).

3.2 Central vs. Regional Governments

In federated welfare states, the question of what should be the respective roles of central and regional governments in providing services and stimulating development has been as significant for regional theory as the question of how to reduce regional disparity.

---

[2] Isard's 1975 *Introduction to Regional Science* marks one of the final bursts of positivistic confidence. It presents a confident compendium of the tools regional science can offer development planners, from econometrics to institutional analysis and the sociology of conflict management. It identifies problems with top-down efforts, such as Operation Bootstrap in Puerto Rico, but it sees the solution lying in broadening the range of technocratic tools, not in abandoning technocracy itself.

Theoretical answers to the division-of-powers-and-responsibilities question have come not from regional scientists and economic development theorists, but from welfare policy analysts, cultural nationalists, and political scientists. Welfare policy analysts have been concerned with the implications of welfare program centralization or decentralization (e.g., centralized service equality and portability vs. regional sensitivity to local needs, conditions and cultures). (For Canadian examples, see: Armitage, 1971; Simeon, 1977; Banting, 1982). Conversely, cultural nationalists have been concerned with the impacts on national and regional identity of federal and regional welfare policies (e.g., policies on language of education, cultural grants, Indian status).

Regional theory from the political science perspective has mainly focused on the implications for federal stability and regional rights of constitutional processes and outcomes. (For Canadian examples, see: Crepau and MacPherson, 1965; Lallier, 1980; Smiley, 1987. For more general theory see: Wheare, 1946; King, 1982.) As well, there has been some (relatively little) work concerned with understanding the non-constitutional factors affecting the success or failure of federated states --factors such as the structure of political parties (Riker, 1964), ideological commitment to federation as an end in itself (Franck, 1968), or regional overlap of language and religion (Dikshit, 1975).

In addition to their academic pursuits, regional theorists concerned with centre-region relationships have found practical roles for themselves as expert consultants and officials in the service of central or regional governments needing to develop their positions and arguments. In Canada, such roles for federation experts seem to have begun with the preparation of the 1940 Rowell Sirois report. They have continued through the constitutional struggles and Federal-Provincial conferences of the 1960s and 1970s, most visibly in the preparation of background and position papers (e.g., Canada, 1975). Thus, like the development technocrats, federation experts have found themselves useful as servants of the state at central or regional levels.[3]

---

[3] In Canada, the 1982 Constitution Act resolved some of the federal-provincial debate over powers, but opened up new issues and concerns, leaving lots of work for the hired-gun regional theorists. Centralists are concerned about erosion of federal control over welfare programs and the variability of individual rights permitted by the "notwithstanding" clause. Yet regional interests, particularly Quebec where a large (40%) minority voted for the intriguing concept of sovereignty association in the emotional referendum of 1980, are also unsatisfied by the new constitution.

The still-to-be-ratified 1987 Meech Lake Accord, which attempted to solve the sticky problem posed by Quebec's lack of support for the 1982 Constitution Act, has like the Act itself created as much confusion and conflict as it has resolved. By proposing to strengthen provincial powers, the Accord satisfied Quebec, but created its own opposition from believers in national service equality, from the two Territories (because creation of new provinces could be vetoed by any existing province) and from unrecognized interests such as First Nations and municipalities. Canadian regional theorists now have a

Because the tensions inherent in federalism will not be resolved, the counsel of regional theorists will always be sought and their theory in a continuous state of development. But perhaps federation theory will be developed at several levels of recursion, not just at the level of central vs. regional governments within welfare states --the term "federation" being defined very generally to include all forms of meta-governments.

At one extreme, international federations (e.g., the European Community, Arab League, OPEC, IMF, North America under free trade, etc.) could increasingly be seen as a concern of regional theory. At the other extreme, which is the particular interest of this paper, localized federations of independent communities, in such forms as Indian tribal councils and economic development associations, will be seen as posing issues to be addressed by regional theory.

If one adopts a general systems theory perspective on federation, then the idea of searching for insights from one level of recursion which can then be applied to other levels, is not far-fetched. Academic regional theory pertaining to the consequences and determinants of various centre-region relationships in federated welfare states could, for example, provide useful insights and beginnings for developing the kind of community-level regional theory which will be called for later in this paper. Similarly, theorists studying at the micro-regional level, and assisting in the development of inter-community co-operation, could contribute to general theories of federalism.[4]

3.3 Regional Coordination of Local Governments and Services

Welfare state regional theory questions of how to reduce disparity and manage centre-region tensions were augmented by a third question: how should the state, at either central or regional (e.g., provincial) levels, provide for the coordination of local governments and local welfare services?

---

new focus for discussion of centralism vs. regionalism. (See, for example: Courchene, 1987; Symonds and Oberlander, 1988).

[4] The work already started on determining the bases for stability in federated states (e.g., by Riker, 1964; Franck; 1968; Dikshit, 1975), shows the potential for general theorizing about federations at all levels, though political scientists would be uncomfortable with extending their analyses of federated states to a more general understanding of federation. Political scientists are in fact at pains to distinguish theories of federal states from theories of unitary states and confederations: much of the literature on federalism is an exercise in defining the differences among these three types of polities. (Witness: Wheare, 1946; Forsyth, 1981; King, 1982; Smiley, 1987).

This third question came into focus with the explosion in metropolitan urban growth and sprawl after World War II. Affluence, baby booms, accelerated urbanization due to improved farming technologies, office employment growth in information services and welfare state bureaucracies, abundant oil, replacement of public transit by the automobile as dominant transport mode, use of welfare state powers and growing resources to build expressways, pent-up demand for low-density living, and continuing weak public planning, all combined to produce an explosion in metropolitan urban growth and sprawl. In Canada, the metropolitan areas doubled in population between 1951 and 1971, and grew from 46% of the national population to 56% in the same period.

Suburbs were created faster than city boundaries were able to be, or allowed to be, expanded. Incremental annexations of urbanizing land no longer sufficed. The solution of amalgamating whole suburban municipalities with the central city was attempted, sometimes successfully as in Alberta during the 1950s and 1960s. But more often, suburban municipalities strongly and successfully resisted amalgamation for a variety of reasons, including civic pride, desire to maintain accessible small government, local government officials' self-interests, and unwillingness to share in the costs of running a big city.

At the same time, central cities demanded equity in paying for facilities such as roads, transit, parks, cultural centres, hospitals, urban renewal, low-income housing, and central social services, which the cities provided for the total metropolitan area's benefit. They wanted some form of revenue sharing with the suburbs, preferably through city expansion in the form of annexation or amalgamation. Like the suburbs, they had their own civic pride and officials' self-interest.

Despite their conflicting interests, the central cities and suburbs in common, plus the senior governments, were concerned that there be coordination in the planning of rapidly expanding utilities, roads, transit and parks, and in the delivery of police, health and social services.

One branch of regional theory became concerned with problems of local government coordination and taxation equity. This branch sought and evaluated innovative solutions which provided for smooth urban growth without simply expanding the unitary city governments. In one form or another, the solutions were for the responsible senior government to force local government co-operation. Thus, this branch of regional theory maintained the welfare state top-down perspective.

Solutions for enforcing local government cooperation began to be implemented in Canada with formation of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto in 1954 as a new second tier over the 13 original municipalities in the metropolitan area.[5] Subsequently, each province created its own solution to metropolitan growth. Between 1965 and 1969, B.C. designated, in both metropolitan and rural areas throughout the province, regional districts which allowed municipalities to opt in for various forms of coordinated service delivery. Alberta created regional planning commissions to coordinate planning and control urban sprawl by controlling subdivision growth. Quebec created regional councils for the Montreal and Quebec Urban Communities in 1969, and Ontario followed up its Toronto initiative with similar two-tier regional governments in other urban areas beginning with Ottawa-Carleton in 1969.

The 1972 Winnipeg Unicity solution was particularly creative. Like the others, it was technocratically conceived (by "a group of Toronto consultants" to the new NDP Manitoba government, as Axworthy [1980] puts it) and legislatively implemented. But as a presaging of the turn in regional development theory (discussed in Section 4 below), part of the top-down vision for Winnipeg was to increase bottom-up democracy.[6]

Concern in the welfare state for effectiveness, efficiency and equity has also been directed to service delivery in rural areas. As in the urban areas, the outcome of this concern was initially to consolidate local governments (e.g., the Alberta school divisions in the 1930s). Opposition by local politicians to consolidation (again , as in urban areas) later led to imposition of regional coordination structures.[7] Some of these rural regional structures were

---

[5] In 1967, the Toronto municipalities were consolidated into one city and 5 "boroughs", but the second-tier metropolitan government was retained. Metro was to be governed by councillors from the local municipalities, funded by regional levies collected locally, and responsible for region-wide services such as sewers, major roads and police. Regional theorists around the world were impressed by the Toronto innovation and regarded it as one promising model for other jurisdictions to consider imposing on their troublesome metropolitan areas.

[6] Though Unicity was created as one new metropolis-wide government in place of the original municipalities (and in place of the ineffective metropolitan government created in 1960), Unicity also attempted to produce more meaningful local government. The legislation provided for a large council of 50 members from 50 wards, 13 community committees in which councillors from three to four wards supervised local functions such as playgrounds and considered development plans, and Resident Advisory Groups for each community committee. However, the localization objective was frustrated: community committees failed to function as planned and RAGS were neither supported by city hall nor understood by citizens. In 1977, the province reduced the number of councillors to 29 and community committees to six.

[7] Shortly after its first election in 1935, the populist welfare-oriented Social Credit government of Alberta forced the consolidation of school districts into much larger divisions. Rural education was seen to improve with bigger schools. The longer commutes for students were accommodated by subsidized school buses. Local involvement in education decreased.

The Social Credit government also created innovative rural counties which functioned as both school boards and municipalities,

replications of the solutions adopted for metropolitan areas (e.g., regional planning commissions in Alberta, regional districts in B.C.). Others, such as the regional county municipalities in Quebec, have more limited functions than the metropolitan authorities.[8]

The theoretical issues related to regional coordination of local governments and services are in some ways similar to the issues related to struggles between central and regional governments in federated states. The similarity is that there is inevitable conflict over the allocations of powers and responsibilities at both intra-state and micro-regional levels. The difference is that in a federated state, there is no final authority other than the constitutional process for resolving conflict; at metropolitan and rural levels, regional solutions are imposed by senior governments. Nevertheless, emerging theories of regional institution building from the bottom up can be enriched by studies of metropolitan and rural regional government forms structured from the top.

Two-tier governments will differ in character depending on whether they are formed top-down or bottom-up, but there are a number of common issues worth exploring: what are the pros and cons of various systems for selecting decision-makers for the upper tier (direct or indirect elections, combinations)? what are the problems and solutions in terms of conflict of interest and pressures of time for councillors serving both levels of a two-tier government? what difficulties are posed for communication between citizens and upper tiers, and what are the possible solutions? what are and should be the criteria for allocating functions between tiers? what are the problems and solutions in terms of coordination of activities and decisions taken by lower and upper tiers? what problems appear with opt-in service arrangements, what solutions? what are the pros and cons of various financing formulas, e.g., in terms of taxation rights by each level, flows of funds from outside sources?
Such questions, and the possible answers, could be useful in deliberations on the formation

---

with provision for representatives on the school boards from the smaller urban municipalities (Alberta, 1972).

[8] In addition to their need to find solutions for coordinating local governments in metropolitan and rural areas, the developing welfare states have also needed to find appropriate forms for the regional delivery of senior government services. With the expansion of hospitals and social workers, the subsidization of transit in metropolitan areas, the development of modern highway systems and parks in rural areas, etc., it became necessary to designate increasing numbers of "logical" service administration and delivery regions, i.e., logical in terms of the administering department. From time to time, regional theorists in some guise (academics, management consultants, local politicians, etc.) have suggested comprehensive rationalization of service region boundaries in the interest of inter-sectoral service coordination, clarity for consumers, and political accountability. For the most part, these efforts were to no avail. If there is a theoretical literature on this type of regional issue, it is not well known, but such literature may be of use to bottom-up regionalists by posing questions about service overlap.

of bottom-up regional institutions, and in stimulating monitoring and theory-oriented research on their operations.[9]

3.4 International Responsibilities of the Welfare State

After World War II, international development aid was organized by the richer nations, first to repair war-ravaged countries (e.g., through the Marshall Plan), then to modernize (i.e., Westernize) non-industrialized ("backward", "underdeveloped", "developing") regions.

The International Monetary Fund was established to maintain currency stability among nations, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) established to provide loans for development. Western nations generally, and especially the United States, have controlled both.

Through IMF and IBRD, through bilateral aid, and through the United Nations which was also set up at the end of the war but with a mitigated U.S. domination, the developed welfare states exercised their perceived international responsibilities: to prevent the spread of communism and to help the poor countries industrialize. It became axiomatic to writers such as Rostow (1961) that development had one meaning, one direction and one route. (Sachs, 1990.) The challenge in development planning was to overcome the barriers to progress posed by inadequate culture (Almond and Coleman, 1960), institutions, infrastructure (the World Banks's forte) and technology (e.g., through the Green Revolution).

International Development theory and regional development theory became synonymous. Many of the same technocratic approaches used by welfare states in their attempts to develop depressed regions and deal with regional disparity in their own countries were tried, urged or forced on cash-poor nations.

By and large, concepts and approaches formulated to guide international development work were considered applicable to internal regional development, and vice-versa. This was the true for agricultural modernization and development of manufacturing, export enhancement and import substitution, designation of growth centres and subsidies to attract outside

---

[9] Answers to such questions, and refinement of the questions themselves, can come, for example, from studies of differential experiences of inter-tier relationships in metropolitan Montreal and Toronto, of citizen involvement in Winnipeg and Ottawa, of B.C. regional districts and Alberta regional planning commissions, of sectorally different special purpose districts, etc. Examples of such studies, but from a limited level-specific perspective, are: Plunkett, 1968; Rose, 1972; Alberta, 1971, 1972; Higgins, 1977; Rowat, 1980).

investors, improvements in physical infrastructure and organizational development, skills upgrading and encouragement of entrepreneurial spirit.

Until the 1970s, neither internal nor international technocratic regional developers addressed the needs of the poor directly. The believed and claimed that benefits would eventually trickle down to the poor, just as had occurred (more or less) after the industrial revolution in Europe and North America. The long-term material benefits would more than compensate for the short-term pain caused by rural dislocation and urban slums. Also until the 1970s, neither international nor internal developers considered environmental, social, cultural or spiritual impacts of their programs.

The similarities between internal and international developers reflects their common exposure to the same books and theories thanks to the universal claims of regional science. Perhaps more significantly, the similarities reflect their common immersion in the world view of the welfare state with its essential statism, technocracy, materialism, optimism about unlimited growth, anti-communism, and concern for the poor.

Sections 4 and 5 of this paper will discuss the reaction to this world view as disillusionment grows with the welfare state's ability to deliver on its promises and with the unforeseen consequences when it has been successful.

3.5 Overview of Regional Theory in the Welfare State

As the welfare state evolved in the 1930's and expanded into the 1970s, the role of regional theory was transformed from critic of market power to servant of state power. The early theorists' softly ideological preoccupations with urbanization and design of urban forms was overshadowed by new concerns with technical issues of development (the universal goals of the welfare state being assumed) and institutional issues of coordination and conflict management within and between government levels.

4. CRITICAL BOTTOM-UP REGIONAL THEORY IN A DECLINING WELFARE STATE

The decline of the welfare state began in the 1970's when stagflation eroded confidence in the state's ability to manage the economy. By 1974, unemployment and inflation rates had

begun to move up together, rather than being traded off in the narrow band policy makers had come to feel comfortable with. In Canada, the sum of the two rates (what some called the discomfort index) had been less than 10 for decades, but from 1972 to 1982 it climbed from 11 to 22.

The causes of this malaise have been variously identified as: (i) commodity price explosions started by OPEC's new-found power to precipitate the 1973 oil crisis and a decade of fast rising oil prices, by the effects of El Nino and USSR farm policies on world feed and food supply, and by other supply disruptions; (ii) lax monetary policy to accommodate fiscal deficits created by the growing institutional (universality-oriented) welfare programs with concurrent increases in other expenditures (military, subsidies) but without offsetting taxation; (iii) liberated women and the big generation of baby boomers rapidly expanding the labour force thus driving up the unemployment rate; (iv) rapid wage increases not being matched by productivity increases in older industrialized countries; (v) capital mobility and flight from high-wage and taxation areas, which reinforced the increasing availability of cheap products from low-wage countries; (vi) the internal contradictions of capitalism finally coming home to roost, perhaps proving the validity of the Kondratieff long-wave theory.

Whatever the explanation for the stagflation malaise of the 1970s, individuals, businesses and governments felt increasingly anxious about the economy. As confidence in the economy waned, so did confidence in the welfare state which was seen as too luxuriously "living off" the economy ("business produces, government distributes") on the one hand, and as increasingly inept at managing the economy on the other. To many, the welfare state with its bloated public agencies, its mollycoddling of unions, its generous use of taxpayers' money to help people who did not need help, and its widespread interference in what should be efficient markets, was, as an institution, the fundamental problem.

The first state responses, in the early-mid 1970s, were to stop the growth of welfare programs after their rapid expansion in the confident and benevolent late 1960s. As the economy continued to worsen, stronger medicine was sought. Finally, Reagan, Thatcher and their likes were elected at the turn of the decade into the 1980's with the more or less explicit mission of dismantling their welfare states. The continuity of government assumptions about the role of government in society, which had fairly consistently held since the 1930s, was broken.

The new right wing governments began with an attack on the concept of full-employment as a right, or even as a good thing. In 1981, a monetary solution was invoked to solve the inflation problem and the 1982 depression (officially a "recession") was created. Bankruptcies

went up, unemployment soared, and the international debt crisis began. The attacks on full employment have been followed by forays of de-regulation, privatization, budget cuts for public institutions, and attempts to limit transfer payments to the "truly needy." While the GNP has recovered since 1982, standards of living, for most people in most countries, have not.

Accumulating fiscal deficits, international debt, the ever looming spectre of renewed inflation, plus the growing strains put on the economy by ecological limits, suggest that decline in the welfare state is going to continue.

As the welfare state declines, and as its inherent inadequacies become increasingly apparent, regional theory in various guises has returned to a critical stance.

Marxist opposition to the welfare state has been steady, of course, on the grounds it is at root capitalist and therefore fundamentally dehumanizing, exploitative of the working class, and inherently unstable. However, Marxists also see the welfare state as progressive and as a stage en route to the truer socialism which will result when capitalism's contradictions lead to final welfare state collapse (Sweezy, 1942).

A more particularly regional theory critique comes from the neo-Marxist underdevelopment theory which emerged in the 1960s, particularly from Latin America and other Third World regions, to criticize the welfare states and the world system of capitalism, for their *inter-regional* exploitation. (See, e.g., Frank 1967, Amin, 1974, Wallerstein, 1979). The neo-Marxists pointed out that regional underdevelopment is not just a lack of development but a condition caused by unequal exchange relations systematically developed by capitalism and enforced by capitalist states. (Underdevelopment theory was perhaps most notably applied in Canada by Watkins and others (1977) in analyzing the North as a "colony within". See also Mathews, 1983.)

A breadth of non-Marxist critiques of the welfare state also appeared in the 1970s. The welfare state was criticized for its gigantism and its assumptions about the meaning of work (Schumacher, 1973), for its technocracy (Illich, 1973),and for the pressures it put on the environment (Meadows *et al.*, 1972). These criticisms had implications for approaches to regional development and for the structure and operation of regional government at various levels.

Finally regional theorists themselves began to criticize the welfare states' internal and international technocratic approaches to regional development. The conception of a dichotomy between top-down and bottom-up approaches (Stohr and Taylor, 1981) was introduced.

"Top-down" referred to the flows of development theories and plans from the rich nations to the poor, from the capitals to the regions, and from the cities to the countryside. It also meant the kinds of development concepts typically flowing down these pipes: industrialization, specialization, free trade and dependency on exports, i.e., functional integration of communities and regions into national and world markets.[10] "Bottom-up" meant, procedurally, the reverse flow of plans: from community to region to developing state. Substantively, bottom-up meant attention to basic needs first rather than waiting for prosperity to trickle down to the poor, and economic diversification and territorial integration of regional territories (through "selective closure", i.e., import substitution) in the interests of stability and local determination of priorities. Such bottom-up approaches were espoused in whole or in part by the International Labour Office (with its 1977 attention to basic needs), community development movements (as identified, for example by authors in Stohr and Taylor, 1981), by practice-oriented theorists such as Friedmann and Douglass (1975) with their famed "agropolitan" concept, and by purer theorists such as Clyde Weaver (1984) with his explorations of anarchist theories.

The difficulty with the substantive bottom-up concepts is that they were formulated top-down, thus contradicting the procedural concept. Accordingly, the first wave of bottom-up theorists tended to be fuzzy on the question of implementation. They could not be very clear about who was to initiate bottom-up planning in the field because it would depend on who picked up their substantive ideas of closure, etc. Those might be small communities, districts, sub-national regions, non-government movements, enlightened experts, or states more sensitive to local needs.

---

[10] These concepts of functional integration date back at least to Ricardo's 1817 notion of "individual advantage" which was adopted by the American regional scientist North (as "comparative advantage") in developing the export base theory of development.

Functional integrationists have their internal debates of course. For instance, there are the industrialization (e.g. Rostow, 1961) and later agricultural (Rodinelli, 1975) schools of development through integration.

It is by definition impossible to formulate a generic theory for substantively guiding bottom-up planning. If plans truly start at the bottom, they may take any number of substantive directions, not necessarily the co-ops promoted by non-governmental organizations, the agropolitan utopia painted by Friedmann and Douglass, or the cooperative labour exchange suggested by Weaver. The bottom-up theorists of the 1970s and early 1980s, then, had to be critics in the same sense that the early, pre- welfare state theorists were critics. In both cases, the theorists could only paint utopian pictures of how urbanization or rural development should be managed because they were unconnected to the relevant locus of power: the state in the case of the pre-welfare theorists, the community or region of communities in the case of the early bottom-up theorists.

What is interesting about the 1980s, is that the disenchantment with the welfare state has now reached far beyond the theorists. Disenchantment is now pervasive in rural areas throughout the world, and communities are increasingly formulating their own alternatives to the welfare state. As will be discussed in the next section, this development and its consequences--the renewal of community and the creation of actual federations as envisaged by anarchists--provides the condition for the evolution of true bottom-up planning and theorizing, i.e., planning to solve real problems by the people who actually have to live with them, and theory which learns from this planning and feeds directly into it.

Critical regional development theory will be supplanted by bottom-up regional theory generated and used at the community level.

5. EMERGING COMMUNITY-CENTRED REGIONAL THEORY IN A TIME OF COMMUNITY RENEWAL

5.1 Renewal of Community

The effects of welfare state decline on community consciousness has been profound. Many people have become increasingly suspicious of the state's ability to manage the economy and/or of its desire to manage it in their interest.

Rural people especially have lost jobs in the forestry, fishing and mineral industries because of poor resource management by government and the ever-growing necessity for companies to become leaner and meaner in the international economy. Self-employed farmers, woodworkers and fishermen have lost capital assets or become deeply indebted in the continuing high interest rate regime. Personal income, from employment, subsidies, and

transfer payments, is not holding pace with inflation. Where family income is holding up it is because women are taking on wage jobs in addition to mothering. Boom and bust, long a feature of rural life, is becoming in many areas one long drawn-out period of hopeless decline. Megaprojects no longer hold the glamour as sources of salvation. People see them failing to produce any lasting community benefit, if they materialize at all. Mostly, they are seen as hurting communities. The welfare state, with its two pillars of market and state, is losing its credibility.

In the face of continuing economic decline, more and more communities in rural areas are seeking ways to have their resource bases managed for stability and sustainability, and ways to reduce dependency on unreliable international commodity markets, outside owners and investors, and senior governments. "Community Economic Development" has within a decade become a household term in many rural areas. New institutions as diverse as community development corporations, co-management of fisheries, and local exchange trading systems, are evolving.

At the same time CED has been growing in rural communities, there has also been a social change occurring. Led by Native communities, there is a movement toward pride in identity, and toward confidence in ability to govern oneselves *as a community*. Just as communities have begun to develop ways to reduce their dependence on external markets and state welfare, they have also begun to resist social subversion from excessive internal market individualism and excessive control by state rules and state-sanctioned professionals.

Native people, of course, are in a unique situation because of their cultures, historical relations with the Government of Canada, and their now recognized aboriginal rights. Culturally, they have more identity and a better sense of what community means (sharing and caring, respect for elders, commitment to place, organization through kinship structures) than most other Canadian communities. Historically, they have been more paternalistically treated, sometimes to their benefit (e.g., health care, protection of communal land) but more often with devastating effect (e.g., the residential schools, the prohibition of potlatching, the establishment of European style band councils, the destruction of community authority in favour of individual welfare rights). But the recognition of aboriginal rights and land claims means that many First Nations, from the Cree-Naskapi to the Dene Nation are now acquiring a reasonable resource base and are working toward self-government and self-reliance building on cultural strengths and traditional methods of government (e.g.: Nuu-chah-nulth's clam management; Gitksan-Wet'suwet'en's child care and general government; the Kahnawake Mohawk's justice system).

Most non-native communities lack the cultural identity and social strength of Natives; they also feel more comfortable with Canada's government, and are less interested in controlling resources. Nevertheless, many are following, even if far behind, the Natives' lead. Some non-Native communities are starting to manage resources communally (e.g., North Cowichan's forest, Burlington Vermont's land trust); many are developing pride in their built environment heritage (not only as tourist attractions); many are becoming homes, places of commitment, rather than just sites to be mined out and abandoned; and in many communities people are cooperating to reinvigorate the economy in a fair and sustainable way through development corporations, co-ops, non-cash exchange networks, and voluntarism.

In rural regions, non-Native and Native communities are beginning to co-operate in economic development corporations, environmental protection movements, resource management institutions, schools, and social services. In fact, it could be argued that non-Natives in some regions (e.g., northwest B.C., the Yukon) are becoming Nativized in their outlook on the environment and the meaning of community. This is an ironic and dramatic change from two decades earlier when Native culture was severely threatened. (The threat of Native assimilation into the Canadian European culture peaked in 1969 with Canada's hastily-withdrawn White Paper on Indians which proposed destroying the institutional bases of Indian communities; this was the same time as the welfare state itself peaked.)

The development of some commonality of world view between Natives and non-Natives is promoted by common environmental threats and economic instability, institutional cooperation, inter-marriage, and shared experiences in school, workplace and social activities. The increasingly shared world view is that communities must go beyond controlling land use, providing municipal services, organizing education and carrying out other functions traditionally assumed by non-Native local governments and now being taken over by First Nations from Indian Affairs and other agencies. Communities now must also build a complete set of institutions to develop their economies, manage resources, take political action, strengthen cultural identity, and enhance social responsibility.

5.2 Regional Associations of Communities

As communities take on more responsibility for their own comprehensive development, they also find it useful to work together informally and formally. That is to say, they define their own regions and create their own regional institutions.

Tribal councils are one new type of bottom-up regional institution. Tribal councils are often defined by ethnicity (e.g., Tsimshian), but they may also be defined by old Indian Affairs district boundaries (e.g., Caribou, Meadow Lake), historical connections and geography (e.g., Gitksan-Wet'suwet'en), treaties (Treaty 8 Tirbal Council in B.C.), and/or strong leadership (Nuu-chah-nulth). Tribal councils have a wide variety of forms and functions which are constantly evolving. Membership can be fluid.

The Gitksan-Wet'suwet'en around the upper Skeena River of B.C. exemplify the possible complexity and rapid evolution of tribal council organization. Eight bands, 5 Gitksan and 3 Wet'su'wet'en, constitute the tribal council proper which is directed by the hereditary chiefs and which functions primarily today to pursue land claims through a major court case and other means. A sixth Gitksan band, which has an independent land claim, is a member with the eight bands in a Gitksan Wet'su'wet'en government commission which was set up a few years ago to take over services (economic development and planning) from Indian Affairs. A third Gitksan-Wet'su-wet'en organization is the Education Society which was established recently under B.C.'s Societies Act to deliver services which non-native communities receive from the province. At the present time, the communities are involved in a major organizational planning task to consolidate the three organizations under political direction from the 76 hereditary house chiefs (Gitksan-Wet'suwet'en, 1989).

The Gitksan-Wet'suwet'en tribal council has been quite stable--the only membership change in recent years is that one of its 3 Wet'suwet'en bands recently transferred in from the Carrier-Sekani tribal council.

Some other tribal councils have a more fluid membership. For example, the first modern tribal council in the vast Caribou area of B.C. around Williams Lake was formed, in reaction to the 1969 white paper, by 15 widely dispersed bands which had been grouped into the Williams Lake district of Indian Affairs for administrative convenience. During the 1970s, the tribal council was mostly used by Indian Affairs to ease consulting with the bands. In the early 1980s, the tribal council began to take over administrative and advisory services from Indian Affairs, and in 1985 the district office was closed. In 1984, the council started to break up: some of the 15 bands became independent, others formed two other tribal councils and two joined an outside council. These splits occurred because of differences in political outlook, personalities and ethnicity. After some further splits and rejoinings, there are now 3 tribal councils in the area. Two are ethnically mixed. The 3 councils have offices in the same building and cooperate on services. The Caribou Tribal Council, for example, provides services to the other two in the vital area of keeping band membership lists.

Thus, despite the instability, the bands in the Williams Lake areas have continually managed to find ways to cooperate. Not only have they formed various regional institutions (tribal councils), but they have also found ways to have these institutions themselves cooperate. The regional cooperation is loose, but significant, and like that of the Gitksan-Wet'suwet'en, it has been created without state intervention.

An example of tribal council complexity is provided by the North Coast Tribal council which includes the two Haida communities, three Tsimshian bands, and until recently, one Nishga community. It is headquartered in Prince Rupert. There are several interesting aspects of this tribal council. One is that it shares membership with the City on economic development bodies. A second is that the 3 Tsimshian bands also are members of an all-Tsimshian tribal council which was set up in 1988 in cooperation with 3 formerly independent bands.

The North Coast tribal council provides an example of a regional organization whose community memberships overlap other Native and non-Native bodies. The example shows how complex regional organization can be when it is created bottom-up.

Together, the above three examples of tribal councils show that effective but disparate inter-community regional associations can be created by the communities themselves. They show quite a different approach to regional coordination from the top-down formation of two-tier government (e.g., Metro Toronto) or the consolidation of local government (e.g., the Alberta school divisions).

It should be noted that there are many Native organizations that function as tribal councils without being called such. They also show the potential for bottom-up regional cooperation. Examples are: Manitoba's Northern Flood Committee established to force implementation of a broad compensation and development agreement signed by bands affected by hydro dams; the Deh-cho region in the NWT which coordinates planning of several Slavey bands; the Nicola Valley Indian Administration which undertakes joint programming on behalf of 5 member bands; inter- tribal council organizations such as the just-being-established fisheries co-management commission in the Skeena River watershed; and province- or territory-wide organizations, such as the Council of Yukon Indians and Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations, established to work with senior levels of government.

Less dramatically, but still significantly, there are non-native regional associations of communities which show the potential for bottom-up cooperation. One of the oldest and most comprehensive in its range of activities is the association of communities around Carbon,

Alberta, which banded together in the mid 1970s to attract industry and to access effectively government grant programs (Bodmer, 1980). Other, more specialized examples, are the bottom-up regional associations formed to work cooperatively on economic development in Newfoundland (Wismer and Pell, 1981), the many tourism development associations, and the Community Futures Committees which take advantage of various funding programs from the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission. An urban example is the social planning organization formed by 3 municipalities in the Coquitlam area of suburban Vancouver.

Finally, but most significantly of all for the long run development of Canada, are the regional associations established jointly by Native and non-Native communities. In B.C. these include some Community Futures Committees, the joint development corporation in the Prince Rupert area discussed above, and the fisheries co-management project of the Nuu-chah-nulth tribal council.[11]

Regional theory has yet to catch up with the rapid expansion of bottom-up development activities and concerns. Potentially, regional theory could assist communities and their regional development of regional associations by studying the dynamics which encourage or hinder the formation and operations of such associations.

But there has been very little theory-oriented study of bottom-up regional associations. One of the rare examples is the analysis by MacDonald (1988) of the Nicola Valley Indian Administration. Descriptive studies such as Bodmer's (1980) of the Alberta association discussed above, and that by Whyte and Whyte (1988) of the federated Basque co-ops around Mondragon, Spain, are very useful for theory- building even if such studies are not explicitly oriented to deriving general principles of bottom-up institution-building. At the other extreme, there is some very theoretical work advancing, but not testing, propositions for the study of inter- community relations (e.g., Young, 1966, discussed in Clavel, 1983).

As was discussed in Section 3, the abundant theoretical literature on federalism and regional coordination of local governments could be instructive in the development of theory on

---

[11] Little has been found written about community-centred regional associations outside Canada, but it is likely such associations are being formed. Certainly one historically significant example is that of the federations of collectives which emerged in many regions of Spain during the revolution from 1936 to 1939 (Dolgoff, 1974). A current Spanish example, which has become celebrated with the recent interest in community economic development, is the fast growing group of worker coops spread throughout the Basque region and centred on the town of Mondragon. Because the co-ops cover such a wide range of production and consumption activities, because the life of so many communities is bound up with them, and because they have such an intricate structure for fostering inter-community cooperation, the co-ops can be seen as an important case of bottom-up regional institution building (Whyte and Whyte, 1988).

bottom-up regions, insofar as it poses and helps answer general questions about structuring inter-government cooperation.[12]

6. CONCLUSION

Assuming continuing decline of the welfare state and the renewal of community, regional theory will have to change its critical stance into one of planning support, just as it so changed in the 1930s. Only now, the support will be for community leaders seeking knowledge to help them organize regional institutions, rather than for technocrats in the welfare state.

The focus for regional theory will no longer be just on how the state should deal with its regions. The focus will now also be on assisting in the healthy development of relations among communities within a region, relations between communities and *their* regional organizations, and relations between the state and community-created regions. The state-region dyadic issues will become state-region-community triadic issues.

Issues of concern to the new bottom-up regional theorists have yet to be delineated, but it is likely they will, at least, pertain to: inter-community conflict management, determination of membership and boundaries of regional coalitions, powers and responsibilities of community vs. regional institutions, representation and decision-making systems, program coordination, finance formulas, and allocative planning. They will also pertain to the impact of state policies (for instance policies related to community futures committees or tribal council funding) on inter-community and community-region relationships.

In summary, regional theory will increasingly be challenged to become relevant to the issues posed by the renewal of communities as potent political units, and by their need to federate.

---

[12] Perhaps the literature on inter-organizational relations can similarly be of use.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, T. Rural Planning and Development. Ottawa: Commission of Conservation Canada. 1917

Almond, G. A. and Coleman, J.S. (eds.). The Politics of the Developing Areas. 1960.

Amin, S. Accumulation on a World Scale: A Critique of the Theory of Underdevelopment. New York: Monthly Review Press. 1974.

Axworthy, L. "Canada: Winnipeg" in Rowat, Donald C. (ed.) International Handbook on Local Government Reorganization. Westport, Conn. Greenwood Press. 1980.

Armitage, A. "The Emerging Realignment of Social Policy--A Problem for Federalism". Canadian Welfare. 47 (5). 1971

Banting, K.G. The Welfare State and Canadian Federalism. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press. 1982

Bodmer, G. H. "Regional Resources Project No. 1: An Innovative Approach to Economic and Social Development." Plan Canada. 20. 1980.

Bradfield, M. Regional Economics Analysis and Policy in Canada Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson. 1988.

Canada. Report of the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations. (Rowell Sirois Report). 1940.

Canada. Report on Social Security for Canada. Prepared for the Advisory Committee on Reconstruction, House of Commons, Special committee on Social Security, by L.C. Marsh. 1943.

Canada. Federal-Provincial Social Security Review. Background Paper on Income Support and Supplementation. (for Federal-Provincial Conference of Ministers of Welfare). 1975.

Clavel, P. Opposition Planning in Wales and Appalachia. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. 1983.

Coffey, W.J. and M. Polese. Still Living together: Recent Trends and Future Directions in Canadian Regional Government. Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy. 1987.

Courchene, T.J. Meech Lake and Federalism: Accord or Discord? Toronto: Robarts Centre for Canadian Studies, York University. 1987.

Crepeau, P.A. and C.B. MacPherson (eds.) The Future of Canadian Federalism. 1965.

Dikshit, R. P. The Political Geography of Federalism: An Inquiry into Origins and Stability. India (sic): MacMillan Company of India. 1975.

Dolgoff, S. (ed.) The Anarchist Collectives: Workers' Self-Management in the Spanish Revolution 1936-1939. Montreal: Black Rose. 1974.

Forsyth, M. Union of States: The Theory and Practice of Confederation. N.Y.: Holmes and Meier. 1981.

Franck, T.W. (ed.) Why Federations Fail. N.Y. New York University Press. 1968.

Frank, A. G. Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America. New York: Monthly Review Press. 1967.

Friedmann, J. and M. Douglass. Agropolitan Development: Towards a New Strategy for Regional Planning in Asia. United Nations: Centre for Regional Development. 1975.

Friedmann, J. and C. Weaver. Territory and Function: The Evolution of Regional Planning. Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1979.

Geddes, P. Cities in Evolution. London. 1915

Gitksan-Wet'suwet'en. The Office of the Hereditary Chiefs of the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en People: Vision Statement. Gitanmaax, Gitksan Territory (B.C.). 1989

Higgins, D.J.H. Urban Canada: Its Government and Politics. Toronto: Macmillan. 1977

Howard, E. Garden Cities of Tomorrow. London. 1902

Illich, I. Tools for Conviviality. New York: Harper & Row: 1973.

International Labour Office. Meeting Basic Needs: Strategies for Eradicating Mass Poverty and Unemployment. Geneva. 1977.

Isard, W. Location and Space Economy: A General Theory Relating to Industrial Location, Market Areas, Land Use, Trade, and Urban Structure. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. 1956.

Isard, W. Introduction to Regional Science. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall. 1975.

King, P. Federalism and Federation. London: Croom Helm. 1982.

Lallier, A. La Souverainete-association: realisme economique ou utopie. Montreal: Cercle du Livre de France. 1980.

Macdonald, T.A. Success Factors in Inter-Community Cooperation: A Case Analysis. Vancouver: UBC M.A. thesis. 1988.

Marsh, L. C. (see Canada, 1943)

Mathews, R. The Creation of Regional Dependency. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1983

Meadows, D. H. *et al.* The Limits to Growth. New York: Universe Books. 1972.

Mumford, L. The Culture of Cities. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. 1938.

Perroux, F. "Economic Space: Theory and Applications." Quarterly Journal of Economics. 64. 1950.

Plunkett, T.J. Urban Canada and Its Government. Toronto: MacMIllan. 1968.

Polese, M. and W. J. Coffey. Les politiques de developpement local: elements de definition. Montreal: Institute national de la recherche scientifique. 1982

Ricardo. D. Principles of Political Economy and Taxation. 1817

Riker, W.H. Federalism: Origins, Operation, Significance. Toronto: Little Brown. 1964.

Rose, A. Governing Metropolitan Toronto: A Social and Political Analysis, 1953-1971. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1972.

Rostow, W. The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-communist Manifesto. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1961.

Savoie, D. J. (ed.) The Canadian Economy: A Regional Perspective. Toronto: Methuen. 1986 (a).

Sachs, Wolfgang. "On the Archaeology of the Development Idea." The Ecologist. Vol. 20 No. 2. Mar./Apr. 1990.

Savoie, D.J. Regional Economic Development: Canada's Search for Solutions. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1986 (b).

Schumacher, E.F. Small is beautiful: A Study of Economics as if People Mattered. London: Blond & Briggs. 1973.

Simeon, R. "Conflicts and Contradictions: Contemporary Strains in Canadian Federation." Proceedings: Conference on Social Development in a Pluralist Society. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development. 1977.

Smiley, D. The Federal Condition in Canada. Toronto:McGraw-Hill Ryerson. 1987.

Stohr, W.B. and D.R.F. Taylor (eds.). Development from Above or Below: The Dialectics of Regional Planning in Developing Countries. New York: John Wiley, 1981.

Sweezy, P.M. The Theory of Capitalist Development. New York: Monthly Review Press. 1942.

Symonds, H. and H. P. Oberlander (eds.) Meech Lake: From Centre to Periphery. Vancouver: Centre for Human Settlements, University of British Columbia. 1988.

Wallerstein, I. The Capitalist World-Economy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1979.

Watkins, M. "A Staple Theory of Economic Growth." Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science. 29 (2) (1963).

Watkins, M. (ed.). Dene Nation: The Colony Within. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1977.

Weaver, C. and T. Gunton. "From Drought Assistance to Megaprojects: Fifty Years of Regional Theory and Policy in Canada". Canadian Journal of Regional Science. V 1 (1982).

Weaver, C. Regional Development and the Local Community: Planning, Politics and Social Context. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons. 1984

Wheare, K.C. Federal Government. London: Oxford University Press. 1946.

Whyte, W.F. and K. K. Whyte. Making Mondragon: The Growth and Dynamics of the Worker Cooperative Complex. Ithaca, N.Y.: ILR Press, Cornell University, 1988.

Wismer, S. and Pell, D. Community Profit: Community-Based Economic Development in Canada. Toronto: Is Five Press. 1981.

Young, F.W. "A Proposal for Cooperative Cross-Cultural Research on Intervillage Systems," Human Organization. XXV (Spring 1966).